## Exhibit 3

Cas	e 1:05-cr-00047-JJF Document 54-7 Filed 02/13/2008 Page 2 of 38 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : CRIMINAL ACTION
5	Plaintiff,
6	v. :
7	NELSON LORA-PENA,
8	Defendant. : NO. 05-47 (KAJ)
9	<del></del>
10	Wilmington, Delaware Tuesday, December 20, 2005 at 3:17 p.m.
11	SENTENCING HEARING
12	
13	BEFORE: HONORABLE KENT A. JORDAN, U.S.D.C.J.
14	
15	APPEARANCES:
16	
17	RICHARD ANDREWS, ESQ. First Assistant United States Attorney
18	Counsel for Government
19	Counsel for government
20	LAW OFFICES OF CHARLES PERUTO, JR. BY: CHARLES PERUTO, JR., ESQ.
21	(Philadelphia, Pennsylvania)
22	Counsel for Defendant
23	
24	Brian P. Gaffigan
25	Registered Merit Reporter

- 000 -

## PROCEEDINGS

(REPORTER'S NOTE: The following sentencing hearing was held in open court, commencing at 3:17 p.m.)

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.

MR. ANDREWS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. This is the time the Court has set for sentencing in the United States vs. Nelson Lora-Pena, Criminal Action 05-47-KAJ.

Mr. Lora-Pena and his attorney, Mr. Peruto are present in the courtroom. And at this time, we're prepared to move forward with sentencing on that matter. Even though I'm not sure there actually appears anything in the docket, I also understand the Court might address the supervised release violation that has been transferred from Rhode Island and given a separate number, even though, based on my discussions with Mr. Peruto, I'm not sure that it doesn't make since to postpone consideration of that until the Court has sentenced him on the main charge and then see where things stand.

THE COURT: All right. Well, Mr. Peruto, why don't I have you come forward, please.

1 My understanding was that the Presentence and 2 Probation Office had been in touch with your colleague, 3 Mr. Driscoll. Have I got that correct? 4 MR. PERUTO: That's right. 5 THE COURT: I believe I have his name right. And there had been some conversation about the supervised 6 7 release violation indicating that charge was not going to be 8 contested. 9 MR. PERUTO: It's not going to be. It's not 10 going to be, judge. It's a supervised release violation and 11 it speaks for itself. 12 THE COURT: Well, I agree, so I'm not sure 13 why we would postpone. Mr. Andrews, do you want to help 14 me out? 15 MR. ANDREWS: Your Honor, maybe I just 16 misunderstood the conversation I had with Mr. Peruto before 17 we got started. 18 THE COURT: Well, why don't we do this? It 19 makes sense to me, actually, to just take of that; okay? 20 Let's get that taken care of because you may have some 21 issues with the presentence report and discussion I'll have 22 on that. So let's deal with what is not contested at this 23 point. And for that purpose, I'm going to ask Mr. Lora-Pena 24 to come forward, if you would, please.

25

ard, if you would, please.

Hold on just a minute. Let me explain. You may

well understand already, Mr. Lora-Pena. Let me explain what 1 2 is going on. We have two things we have to deal with. You 3 were convicted of the charges that you were tried for in this court but you also face a penalty associated with your 4 plea in Rhode Island and a supervised release violation 6 order that you be held to account for that was issued in Rhode Island that was transferred down to this court by the judge up there, to be addressed by me at the same time, basically, as we're dealing with this. So I just need 10 to ascertain or make sure that if in fact you are not 11 contesting that you violated your supervised release up there that the record is clear on that. THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. I admit to it, 14 that I violated my probation. I admit to it. THE COURT: All right. Well, here is what I need to do. I'm going to go ahead have the courtroom deputy swear you in, ask a few questions in that regard and make a record. All right?

5

7

8

9

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Defendant, NELSON LORA-PENA, placed under oath at 3:07 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Now, the specific charge here is that you violated condition two of your supervised release by failing to report to the probation officer, condition four of the supervised release by failing to make child support payments as ordered, condition six by failing

to report a change of address, condition 11 by failing to report a new arrest, and a violation of condition seven regarding possession of a controlled substance. However, the Probation Office has asked that we dismiss that condition seven. So we're here talking about conditions two, four, six and eleven. Do you understand what I just said, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

MR. PERUTO: If I could just interject here, judge.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. PERUTO: The defendant's wife was here

MR. PERUTO: The defendant's wife was here throughout the proceedings for the trial, and I can represent to the Court that she was not pushing for the child support enforcement in light of the fact that he had sent her as much money as he could along the way. So he was not prepared to admit -- I don't know if it's going to make a great deal of difference -- admit on that condition or on any cocaine charge, but the other charges he would in fact be admitting to.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PERUTO: I don't know if it will make any difference.

THE COURT: All right. But as to condition two, the failure to report to the probation officer; condition

1 11, failure to report an arrest; condition six, failure to 2 report a new address? 3 MR. PERUTO: It's admitted to. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Andrews, do you have any problem 5 with proceeding on those three and leaving the other two? 6 MR. ANDREWS: Your Honor, Mr. Selvaggi told me 7 before the hearing that he would be perfectly amenable 8 dropping the charge of the violation of condition number 9 four, also. So I'm perfectly happy to proceed on the basis 10 of those three admissions. 11 THE COURT: All right. Now, just real 12 quickly. I want you to understand that if you wanted to, 13 Mr. Lora-Pena, you could contest the facts here. In other 14 words, you don't have to admit to these violations. 15 going to ask you a few questions to make sure you understand 16 what your rights are and that you are knowingly --17 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, excuse me. Can 18 you speak up a little? Because I got hearing problem, so 19 I can't hear clear what you say to me. 20 THE COURT: All right. Is that better for 21 you? 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Okay. First, I want you to tell 24 me how far -- well, tell me how old you are today. 25 THE DEFENDANT: I'm 39.

1	THE COURT: When is your birthday?
2	THE DEFENDANT: August 2nd, 1966.
3	THE COURT: And how far did you go in school?
4	THE DEFENDANT: I graduated, 1985.
5	THE COURT: High school?
6	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Okay. Have you been hospitalized
8	or treated for any mental illness or addiction to drugs?
9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did. When I was on
10	supervised release from my probation officer, he sent me
11	to
12	THE COURT: Okay. Several years ago?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
14	THE COURT: Are you suffering from, today, from
15	any mental illness or addiction to drugs that you are aware
16	of?
17	THE DEFENDANT: You could say, yes. I'm sorry.
18	Yes, I am. I'm a drug addict, Your Honor.
19	THE COURT: All right. Are you under the
20	influence of drugs at this time?
21	THE DEFENDANT: No, sir.
22	THE COURT: All right. Are you under the
23	influence of any alcoholic beverage of any kind at this
24	time?
25	THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: And do you understand the purpose 2 of our discussion here is to establish whether or not you 3 violated supervised release and that that has some penalties 4 associated with it? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Now, those three charges that 7 we're here talking about: condition number two, failure to 8 report to a probation officer; condition number six, failure

to report a change of address; and condition number eleven, failure to report a new address. Do you understand that

those are the things that the Government is now arguing that

you should be held to account for violating on your previous

supervised release? Do you understand that?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with the representation that Mr. Peruto has given you in the course of the case you had here and any discussions you had with him about the supervised release violation?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And is your willingness to admit or acknowledge that you violated your supervised release something that you had an opportunity to discuss fully with Mr. Peruto?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I mean I'll admit to that, Your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Has anybody attempted to force you 2 to admit to this violation? Are you doing it of your own free will? 3 4 THE DEFENDANT: I'm doing it of my own free 5 will. 6 THE COURT: Let me just ask you real quickly, if 7 I could. Mr. Andrews, if we had to go to a hearing on this, 8 how would you prove these violations? 9 MR. ANDREWS: Your Honor, I would call Probation 10 Officer John Selvaggi who has been in contact with Kurt 11 O'Sullivan who was the supervising U.S. Probation officer at 12 the time and who was familiar with the case, and basically he would say what the records of the Probation Office up 13 14 there showed, combined with the fact Mr. Lora-Pena was 15 arrested here for being a fugitive for nine years last year 16 or earlier this year. And, more specifically, that he 17 basically dropped out of contact with the probation officer, 18 Probation Office there. January 5th, 1996 was the last time 19 that they saw him and he just dropped off the face of the 20 earth from that point forward. 21 THE COURT: All right. 22 Mr. Peruto, is there anything you want to 23 contest or argue with respect to that?

MR. PERUTO: No, sir. They are the facts.

THE COURT: All right. Now, then I'm going to

24

25

go ahead and make a finding based on a preponderance of the evidence, including Mr. Lora-Pena's statement that in fact he is guilty of those supervised release violations. I heard you correct on that, didn't I, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That he is in violation of those three conditions: numbers two, six and eleven, all of which are classified as grade C violations pursuant to U.S. sentencing guideline 7B1.1a3 and which then call for a term of imprisonment of at least five months but no more than 11 months based on the criminal history category

Mr. Lora-Pena had at the time of that conviction.

Do you have any disagreement with that guideline range, Mr. Peruto?

MR. PERUTO: I do not, sir.

THE COURT: Mr. Andrews?

MR. ANDREWS: No, Your Honor.

established that and we have established the guideline range for that. We'll go ahead and talk about the right sentence for that after we now deal with the guideline range associated with the offense of conviction for which you were tried in this Court, Mr. Lora-Pena; okay?

So at this point, let me just ask, do you have any factual dispute or legal dispute, Mr. Peruto, with the

Τ

presentence report? And if we're going to have some legal
argument for awhile, I don't know, Mr. Peruto --

MR. PERUTO: You can sit down.

THE COURT: Okay. Why don't you go ahead and have a seat, Mr. Lora-Pena, and I'll have you back up here in a few minutes.

MR. PERUTO: Judge, my office has been in contact with Mr. Durkin. As a matter of fact, we just spoke again today. I understand how he arrived at the guideline calculation which we respectfully disagree with. We believe that they can be grouped and that his original calculation was correct on the 70-to-87 month calculation.

THE COURT: Well, explain to me. Explain to me why you think they can be grouped. This is not an insignificant amount.

MR. PERUTO: Yes, I know. Judge, the guidelines go back and forth. I understand there are specific language on this because there were four marshals. But also, it's one criminal episode. If it was 100 marshals, it wouldn't be calculated any differently than one criminal episode. It's how many people were trying arrest him would not, should not affect the guideline calculation.

THE COURT: What guideline provision are you relying on?

MR. PERUTO: The basic offense level of the --

1 I'm looking at the language, which I didn't bring my book 2 but I'm looking at the language and the basic calculation 3 where --4 THE COURT: Hold on a minute. I'm happy to lend 5 you this. Why don't I have the courtroom deputy hand this 6 to you, if it would be of assistance to you. 7 (Sentencing guidelines book passed back.) 8 MR. PERUTO: And I apologize. I was on trial and I sent a letter saying I couldn't look this up. 9 10 didn't have enough time. 11 THE COURT: That's all right, Mr. Peruto. 12 know this is important to you and your client. I'm happy to 13 take the time here that you would like to have. 14 (Pause.) 15 THE COURT: If it's of any assistance to you, 16 let me just mention that Section 3D1.4 is the multiple count 17 adjustment section used in the presentence report. 18 MR. PERUTO: That's the page I'm on, judge. 19 THE COURT: All right. 20 MR. PERUTO: The 3A1.4 seems to indicate that it 21 cannot be grouped. That's conceded. 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 MR. PERUTO: I'm looking at the general. 24 was looking at the Base Offense Level, my argument is it 25 wouldn't matter how many marshals were involved.

THE COURT: All right. So let me make sure I understand. I'll reflect this back to you. It's not -- you are not relying on a specific guideline section but on a general principle as you have just articulated it, that one episode as you have described it or criminal event should be treated as amenable to grouping. Have I understood you right?

MR. PERUTO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. I'll go ahead and take back my book, if you are willing to give it back. And I'll ask the Government, Mr. Andrews, if you would please respond to this argument.

(Sentencing guideline book passed forward.)

MR. ANDREWS: Your Honor, I'm looking at -- I don't know whether you have the 2005 book in front of you but I'm looking at page 338 which is under Section 3D1.2, and it says groups of closely related counts and it has two lists. One offense is covered by the guidelines that are to be grouped and one they're specifically excluded. And under specifically excluded, the first thing listed is all offenses in chapter two, part A, which is the assault provisions that are at issue in this case.

Further, when I had provided the case to the U.S. Probation Office, United States vs. Johnson, which is at 931 F2d 238, and that involved the armed robbery of three

1 As
2 th
3 ha
4 pa
5 hi
6 pi
7 th
8 gi
9 th
10 it

Assistant U.S. Attorneys so I had a particular interest in the case. That occurred in Newark, New Jersey. And I haven't looked at the case for awhile, but basically the part that I think that I've got in front of me that is highlighted in yellow talks about applying the section 3D1.2 procedure to the facts of this case. The assault of the three Assistant U.S. Attorneys are treated as distinct groups because they involve different victims. And I think the case is perhaps more complex so I may be glossing over it a little bit, but I thought this was pretty much directly on point.

And, essentially, it's the same thing here.

You have an assault on four U.S. Marshals. They're each a separate victim and so they should be treated as distinct groups. So I believe not only is the guideline fairly specific but I believe the case law supports that interpretation.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Peruto, I don't know whether there is anything you want to add above that and if not, we'll move to what, if any, other issues you want to raise.

MR. PERUTO: Just in 10 seconds, judge. When you rob somebody, it's an intentional act. You see your victims, you know who it is and you are going to rob them. If there are five people there, that's five counts of

robbery. But in this particular case, if a hundred marshals came to arrest him ... you know the rest of my argument.

THE COURT: Okay. Yes. Any other points with respect to either the factual or legal issues addressed in the presentence report?

MR. PERUTO: Well, you heard the defendants' testimony, judge. The discharge of the weapon had nothing to do with him and it was discharged, and you saw where it landed with the physical evidence where it was pointing, and it went out straight which means it would have to be on the ground. So it was a factual thing. He denied he had anything to do or his hands were not on the rifle when it was discharged. And I understand he is getting a five level enhancement because that rifle was discharged. It had nothing to do with the case at bar, but I understand to the victor goes the spoils so I'm just making the objection.

THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else?
THE DEFENDANT: No, not on the calculations.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Andrews, with respect to the discharge of the weapon.

MR. ANDREWS: Your Honor, as you know, I wasn't at the trial. I did talk to the marshals beforehand and my belief is that the trial testimony and the trial verdict pretty much established that the gun went off while the defendant was reaching for it and that he caused it to go

off and, therefore, I think the guideline applies.

2

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I don't know.

3

Mr. Peruto, again I'll give you the last word, if you want

4

it.

MR. PERUTO: (Stands up and sits back down,

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Peruto is indicating he

First, as to the grouping, I think I understand

6

5

indicating no.)

7

doesn't have anything he wants to add, so I'll go ahead and

9

8

rule on these two points.

10

the policy argument that you have made, Mr. Peruto, but the

11 12

quidelines are very explicit. 3D1.2d tells me I'm not to

13

group these counts. And that is a product of the reflection

14

of the Commission, and the rationale to that is as has been

15

described with counsel for the Government and is essentially

16

that which is laid out in the case that the Government has

17

cited here today. So I'm not grouping the counts.

18

presentence report, and including the calculation associated

I accept the calculations as set forth in the

19 20

with the discharge of the weapon. Given the verdict of the

21

jury and the evidence which  ${\ensuremath{\text{I}}}$ , myself heard at least to a

22

preponderance of the evidence, I conclude that that weapon

23

was discharged as a result of and as a direct consequence of

24

the struggle which was going on between the marshal and the

25

defendant. I should say the particular deputy marshal who

You can all sit down.

23

24

25

I want the record to reflect that you may have recognized them when they came up. Some of them were here for all of the proceedings. Some of them were here for the 1 last day.

1.7

THE COURT: I certainly recognize some of them and their names from the letters, which I received and which I have had a chance to look at. I want to assure the family I've had a chance to see the things they sent to me. All right?

MR. PERUTO: Judge, if I may, Ernesto just wanted to address you briefly on this matter, if he could.

THE COURT: All right. I'll hear from him.

MR. LORA: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. LORA: This is a moment that I never had, but this is an opportunity for a new life for my brother. That gentleman that is sitting there could be an honor to me and my father, could be a good man in society. It was wrong for him flee, I believe in that, but what he has done, okay, in the past. He has his friends to come here and tell you that he is innocent.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. LORA: And one last thing is I know my brother did not do what he was being charged, what he is being here, just as simple as that. His four — the four marshals are in their houses. There is no injury, with no expense of medical, and that is very important to see. And if my brother touch that pistol that they say that was

discharged, they would have shot my brother. I guaranteed you that. Anybody that reaches an arm here in the United States is directly going to get shot, no matter what. And I believe in my brother 100 percent, because we are taught as a family in this country, where we have 40 years that we're all United States American citizens. And that's the only thing that I want to tell you. Just look at him. We all have families here. There's always -- like America, there's always an opportunity. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. LORA: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. PERUTO: Judge, I do have a few remarks.

This defendant is not an American citizen. He didn't know that himself, which is the ironic twist here. He thought he was born in New York City. As it turns out, he was three months old when he came to this country but he has obviously no way of knowing that. Never applied for citizenship.

Never knew that he was a foreigner. He has no contacts whatsoever with the Dominican Republic. He doesn't know anybody there. Yet there is an immigration detainer on him and he is going to be deported, we all know that, and there is nothing that this Court can do about that. No matter if you give him probation or you give him a million years, there is nothing that is going to affect that.

It's just ironic whatever punishment he serves here, he is then banished to the Domincan Republic, which is more punishment than any of us can envision, including him.

I would ask that you take that into consideration. You know that the guidelines are advisory. It's a strong advisory but they're advisory. He is going to be deported. If his family wants to join him, that is on them, and Your Honor knows that. But it's an added punishment because of those three months time where he believes he was born in New York but there is no paperwork to prove it. Matter of fact, the paperwork seems to indicate otherwise, and that is what I'm told by the immigration lawyer, that it's a losing case, so I want Your Honor to keep that under distribution.

Secondly, there were no injuries here. We're not here to relitigate the case and you know that. And I tried to tell the defendant today is not the day to relitigate this case. But there were no injuries. The pit bulls did not attack anybody but each other. The pit bulls were put in a room. They attacked each other, if you remember. They were injured somewhat themselves.

THE COURT: Well, I remember hearing testimony a little bit differently than that, but I certainly understand that that is the defendant's perspective on the evidence.

MR. PERUTO: Nobody was injured except the defendant. I think there was a great deal was made out of a

minor scratch that was on one of the hands of one of the marshals, so I know that this Court would give a more severe sentence if any of them were in fact injured. I believe that the marshal himself in this particular case was not trying to exaggerate what happened and he was trying to be as candid as possible. And this defendant testified that it was his observation that two of the marshals were excessive and two of them were trying to help him, especially the marshal. I don't know what sense that would make unless he really felt that way, that two of them were overreacting. And the marshal himself I believe was the last Government witness. The defendant didn't have much of a quarrel with he had to say, if Your Honor will recall. The trial wasn't that long ago.

I will ask to you take all of this into consideration. The guidelines are severe, especially in light of the deportation. He knows he -- I mean his life, it's just been ridiculous. To walk away from the supervised release problem in Rhode Island and to turn it upside down for a few months is totally ridiculous, and it's just one thing that compounded itself, compounded itself, compounded itself to where we're now here. It's a real snowball effect.

I believe the defendant wants to address you before sentencing and that's all the remarks I would like to

THE COURT: I'm sorry. I have the revised one,

1 THE DEFENDANT: So I mean this kid is not me. 2 And look at number 34, please. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 THE DEFENDANT: According to court record 5 document, on July 6th, 1972, the defendant presented an application for passport in the name of Bubois B. Aviles. 6 7 July the 6th, 1972. That makes me six years old. 8 9 THE COURT: All right. 10 THE DEFENDANT: I just wanted to prove a point 11 here. 12 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else 13 you want to point to in the presentence report or this 14 earlier version of it? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I admit that I'm 16 in for 10 years. I'm in for 10 years. I'm human. 17 make mistakes. I admit to that. But I'm tired of getting 18 in trouble, constantly influenced by friends. I wasn't 19 trying to get in trouble, trouble always haunt me. If you 20 can see my records, I pled quilty to everything that I have 21 done because I admit that I did it. But in this case, how 22 was I going to plead guilty to something I haven't done and 23 I am still innocent. I know I am. And you just said 24 yourself -- number seven. Would you look at seven, please, 25

sir?

1 THE COURT: Sure. Go ahead. 2 THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry. 16. 3 THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lora-Pena, I have it 4 in front of me. 5 THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry. I'm just a little 6 nervous. 7 It says by virtue of evidence presented in 8 trial, the defendant was responsible for grabbing at the marshal's shotgun and cause it to discharge. And at the 9 10 end, I'll make it short, it says based on information. Your 11 Honor, I'm trying to ask myself this question. What is justice about? Justice about the truth. I'm asking, is it 12 13 about the truth? THE COURT: Well, I'm not here to answer your 1415 I'm here to hear what you would like to say, sir, 16 so if there is something you want to say, go ahead. 17 THE DEFENDANT: I'm just asking because it says 18 information. I thought justice was about the truth. 19 asking you, Your Honor. You just said it yourself. You 20 heard the evidence. What evidence? What evidence is 21 information? It was saying information that he said. 22 Basically I'm accused by, he say, information. Where is it? 23 Where is my fingerprints on the weapon? Where is it? No 24 fingerprints, nothing. Just by information?

That is one thing the TV teaches you a lot.

25

1 Teaches you so much. TV is knowledge and you learn so much. 2 That's all I did was watch TV, and I was watching last week. 3 It came to my attention. I watch Numbers. Numbers about 4 how Federal Bureau of Investigation, they investigate crime scene investigation. How can I be convicted of a crime, 5 6 there is no evidence? Where is it? Where? Where is my 7 fingerprints? Where is my gun powder? Where is the 8 analysis? If you can find my fingerprints on that weapon, 9 I will plead guilty to that. And you can charge to that 10 crime whatever the guidelines come into that crime. Where 11 is it? Where? This is information. Basically, this court, 12 this trial is about he say. This is about the truth. 13 That's what I'm trying to figure this out. Information. 14 Where is it? 15 16 life. 17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Look at my face, Your Honor. I'm scarred for Look at my face. I'm scarred for life. Look at my face. My appearance is different. My teeth is chipped. Sometimes I pee blood, I piss blood. My health is not -- my health is not right. I need to see a doctor. Mentally, I'm not okay, you know, because the marshals could have -agents, trained agents, trained agents, official agents, they could have handled that. They could have handled that better. These are trained agents.

My cousin was in the Marines for six years. Не was an E-3, a lance corporal, and you mean to tell me I

2 3

4

5

6

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

20

19

21 22

23

24

25

could have taken that weapon? There is no way. He was trained for combat. And I know it's a fact, it's fact. You show me those fingerprints and the gun powders -- the gun powder. Did I shoot that weapon? I will plead guilty to it. I did not touch that weapon. I didn't. But based on information? That is not justice. That is not the truth. That is information.

And that's -- if I would had done it, when my first lawyer came to me, and I took the plea for 33 mandatory, I would have took it because I would have done it, but I didn't do it. I haven't done nothing. Look at my I'm scarred for life. Why? Why I have to pay for something they did to me? I got brutally beaten, throw me in jail for nine, almost nine months. For what? Because of what they demonstrate? That's justice? That is not justice. What I'm asking, justice to be served today.

Where is his medical bills? Where is the medical bills? Why didn't he go to a doctor? For all he knows, I had hepatitis, HIV. Nothing like that. Nothing. It's all about information.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Lora-Pena, I think I have your position. Is there anything other than contesting your innocence, which I hear you?

THE DEFENDANT: Nothing, Your Honor. I just want the truth. That's all, Your Honor.

Jast

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: Please, I'm begging. I'm begging. The only hope I have is you. You're the only one. I'm asking for hope and mercy. It seems like the whole world is coming down like I'm the baddest guy in the world. I didn't get in trouble for ten years. I don't want no more trouble. I don't, Your Honor. Find the way in your heart, please, to forgive me. I know the Government is mad because I ran for 10 years. I don't want no more trouble. I just want to be with my family. I said I'm 40 years old. I know from right and wrong. I know I can be a better person. I know I can. Please.

THE COURT: All right.

THE DEFENDANT: Forgive me.

THE COURT: I've heard what you had to say.

Mr. Lora-Pena and Mr. Peruto, go ahead and be seated.

Mr. Andrews, the sentencing position on behalf of the Government.

MR. ANDREWS: Your Honor, basically we recommend the sentence within the guideline range. I think one thing that is important to note is in the presentence report, as a result of Mr. Lora-Pena's conduct, someone could have been killed that day and that "someone" could have been him or

it could have been one of the marshals or other law enforcement officers who were at the scene. He caused the gun to discharge and he could be facing -- so, in fact, the injuries that the marshal suffered was fairly inconsequential but his conduct was extremely serious because it could have resulted in much more serious injury than it did.

THE COURT: And would you agree that that is captured at least in part in the functioning of the guidelines with the addition of the five points for the discharge of the weapon and the lack of grouping?

MR. ANDREWS: I believe it is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Let me explain to you how we're going to proceed from this point, Mr. Lora-Pena. I'm going to talk to you about the sentence I intend to impose. I'll state the sentence I intend to impose. I'll give your and the attorney for the Government an opportunity to tell me if there is any reason why that sentence as stated ought not be imposed, and if there isn't a legal reason that we have already covered, why it ought not be imposed, I'll go ahead and order it imposed as stated.

First, I'll take a moment to speak directly to your family who are in the courtroom and who took the time to write letters on your behalf.

It's evident that whatever else, good or bad has

happened to you in your life, you have been lucky enough to have a supportive family unit. Not everybody is blessed to have that. They need to understand, though, what we're here to do today and so do you.

brother who I permitted to speak contests your innocence as well. It may be that you persuade an appellate court that there was some flaw in the trial proceeding itself that requires the evidence to be looked at anew. You have appellate rights which I will mention to you at the close of this. But today is, as your own lawyer has aptly put it, not a day to talk about guilt or innocence because a jury has spoken on that issue. And it said, after hearing the evidence, you're guilty of the offense. So I'm not at liberty to ignore that verdict.

And I sat through the trial myself. And I heard the evidence myself. And I don't think that the jury went amiss. It sounded to me like you fled. You're used to living as a fugitive and you preferred to live as a fugitive than to live in jail and that as a consequence of your decision to flee, there was a fight. Your dogs, attack dogs were in the melee for awhile. The gun was discharged. And it is only by the grace of good fortune, in a series of events that could be called very sad and unfortunate for you, it's only by good fortune that no one was hurt more

I understand your statements here today that you certainly feel like you were injured. And that is a most unfortunate thing. That out of all of this event, your focus is, continues to be thoroughly and entirely and totally upon yourself. So I don't know anything that I can say here today will help you understand this sentencing

process any better, but I'm taking a shot at it anyway.

In our society, we have to abide by certain basic norms, and among those norms are a respect for people who operate, work in law enforcement and help keep the rest of us free and safe. I'm going to be dealing with a sentence for you on the supervised release violation. I'll be talking about that in a moment as well.

It was obviously a serious mistake for you to flee Rhode Island and violate your supervised release. But when you were found, lo these many years later, the offense was made tremendously worse by the decision to put law enforcement officers at risk. That's something that our society cannot tolerate. And that's why you face a significant period of incarceration for this offense. It can be accepted, and it won't be accepted.

So I'm going to sentence you within the guideline range. I'm going to sentence you toward the lower end of that range, not because I take lightly what you did

but because it's a severe range. At a minimum, you've got 87 months in front of you for this offense. The guideline policy statements tell me that the supervised release violation should be added consecutively. So if I do, that the minimum you are facing is 92 months in prison. And then when that is all done, in all likelihood, as your attorney has said, you face deportation.

So even at the lowest end of the guideline range, you face very severe consequences. And since I believe that those consequences are warranted, this is the sentence I intend to impose:

On the supervised release offense, a term of five months, which I will get to in greater detail in a moment.

On the offense of conviction in this case, pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, it is the judgment of the Court that the defendant Nelson Lora-Pena is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, to be imprisoned for a term of 87 months on each of counts one through three and 12 months on count four, all counts to be served concurrently.

Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of three years. This term consists of terms of three years on each of counts one through three and one year on count four, all

Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons, the defendant shall report in person to the Probation Office in the District to which the defendant is released.

While on supervised release, the defendant shall not commit another federal, state or local crime, shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court and shall comply with the following additional conditions:

The defendant shall not illegally possess a controlled substance.

The defendant shall not possess a firearm or destructive device.

The defendant shall cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer.

In addition, the defendant shall comply with the following special conditions:

The defendant shall participate in a drug aftercare treatment program at the direction of the probation officer which may include testing.

If deported, the defendant's term of supervised release shall run inactively as long as he remains outside the United States. Should he reenter the United States illegally after deportation, such actions shall be

ought not be imposed, Mr. Peruto?

MR. PERUTO: No, sir.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Mr. Andrews?

MR. ANDREWS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Then I order those sentences imposed as stated.

Now as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Lora-Pena, you have appellate rights. I'm going to put what I've talked to you about here today into a written document called a Judgment and Commitment Order. It might take a few days for me to get that filed, but as soon as it's filed, once it's filed, you have 10 days. The clock starts to run and you have 10 days within which to file a notice of appeal. If you want to take this up to the Third Circuit, which is the Court of Appeals over this Court. And I'm sure that Mr. Peruto will be speaking to you about that further, if you would like.

All right. Is there anything further to come before the Court at this time? Mr. Andrews?

MR. ANDREWS: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Peruto?

MR. PERUTO: Yes, sir. Judge, the defendant is indigent. He can file whatever papers the Court requires of him but he does not have the wherewithal to obtain the transcripts and to file the necessary fees and for counsel, so we would ask that those steps be taken to obtain an affidavit from him of indigency so he could qualify.

THE COURT: Certainly if that paperwork is filed and it's in order, you can be assured that the necessary

## 1:05-cr-00047-JJF Document 54-7 Filed 02/13/2008 Page 38 of 38 <sup>36</sup> 1 steps will be taken. Now, I tell you candidly, sitting 2 here, I don't know whether he files that here or in the 3 Court of Appeals, but wherever it's supposed to go, I'm sure 4 you will have to make sure it gets to the right spot, and it 5 will be acted on accordingly. All right?

MR. PERUTO: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: All right. We stand in recess.

(Sentencing hearing ends at 3:55 p.m.)